

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD  
AGENDA BRIEFING WORKSHOP

JOE SERNA JR., CAL EPA BUILDING  
COASTAL HEARING ROOM  
1001 I STREET, SECOND FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2001

9:36 A.M.

Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR, CRR  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License Number 8751

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

LINDA MOULTON-PATTERSON, Chair

STEVEN R. JONES

JOSE MEDINA

MICHAEL PAPARIAN

DAVID A. ROBERTI

STAFF PRESENT:

MARK LEARY, Executive Director

KATHRYN TOBIAS, Chief Legal Counsel

DEBORAH MCKEE, Board Assistant

DONNA HOGAN, Acting Board Secretary

--oOo--

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

iii

I N D E X

	PAGE
Discussion of the Board's 2001 Strategic Plan	1
Staff Presentation	1
Public Comments	8
Board Discussion	45
Adjournment	57
Certificate of Certified Shorthand Reporter	58

--oOo--

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (Thereupon the review of the monthly Board  
3 meeting agenda was conducted.)

4 --oOo--

5 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Okay. We're  
6 going to move to our discussion of the strategic plan. At  
7 this time there are speaker slips on the back table, and  
8 we anticipate a few speakers.

9 And at this time I'd like to turn it over to  
10 Rubia Packard.

11 MS. PACKARD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good  
12 morning, Board members. My name is Rubia Packard with  
13 the Board's Policy and Analysis Office. And I'd like to  
14 provide an introduction to this item today, agenda item  
15 one, consideration, excuse me, this afternoon's agenda  
16 item, consideration of adoption or discussion of the  
17 Board's 2001 Strategic Plan. It's intended to be a  
18 workshop type of discussion for the agenda item next  
19 week.

20 As you know, we've been working on developing a  
21 new plan for the Board for some time. The foundational  
22 materials for this plan were developed in 1999 through  
23 the Board's 21st century policy project.

24 The purpose of that project was to consult with  
25 all of our staff and external interested parties and

1 stakeholders to identify key trends and issues in solid  
2 waste management, and then to use that information to  
3 craft the Board's direction for the first five to ten  
4 years of the new century.

5 This was done by conducting two stakeholder  
6 forums which were attended by over 200 representatives  
7 from business, industry, local, state and federal  
8 governments, environmental groups, and the legislature,  
9 as well as Board staff and other state agency  
10 representatives.

11 The top issues that are identified through these  
12 forums as well as the 21st -- excuse me.

13 The top issues that were identified through  
14 these forums as well as the 21st century revision  
15 statement that came out of those sessions were used as  
16 the starting point for discussions of key goals and  
17 objectives to be included in the Board's 2001 plan.

18 Additionally, we conducted two publicly noticed  
19 stakeholder forums in February and March of this year;  
20 one for external stakeholders, and one for internal  
21 stakeholders, to hear comments on the 21st century  
22 material, the vision crafted by CAL EPA, and any other  
23 issues that needed to be addressed in the new plan.

24 The vision, mission and values -- excuse me.

25 The vision, mission, values, and goals were

1 developed through the Board's executive team utilizing  
2 input from the Board through interviews with Board  
3 members and through Board meetings. These elements were  
4 presented to the Board for discussion and direction at  
5 the June, 2001 Board meeting.

6 The objectives and strategies were developed  
7 through internal teams with representatives from Board  
8 member offices, the executive team, and staff. These  
9 elements were presented to the Board for discussion and  
10 direction at the August, 2001 Board meeting.

11 The final document, which is the plan included  
12 as attachment one to agenda item one, was prepared in  
13 accordance with the format requested by Cal EPA. Each  
14 team also developed the explanatory text included in this  
15 document for each of the goals.

16 The plan before you has been reviewed and  
17 commented on by Cal EPA as well as the other Boards and  
18 departments within Cal EPA.

19 In terms of next steps. Once the Board  
20 finalizes and adopts its 2001 strategic plan, we will be  
21 preparing implementation or action plans, as well as  
22 performance measures for specific strategies to be  
23 pursued.

24 Staff is currently developing a process for  
25 this, but the basis for this work will likely once again

1 be the use of cross-divisional work teams to develop  
2 specific action steps with input from affected and  
3 interested stakeholders.

4 We are also developing recommendations on the  
5 monitoring and reporting process to the Board, but we  
6 envision something like a quarterly public report to the  
7 Board during Board meetings to allow for a public  
8 discussion of our progress.

9 In the October, 2001 Board meeting, the Board  
10 directed staff to allow for an additional opportunity for  
11 public review and comment of the proposed plan by  
12 continuing consideration of the draft plan to this  
13 month's Board meeting.

14 We have received some very specific comments  
15 from a group representing a variety of business and  
16 industry interests called the Thursday Group. I would  
17 like to address a few of the areas raised by the Thursday  
18 Group, and defer the others to the Board's discussion  
19 after any public speakers have made their remarks.

20 Comments were provided by the Thursday Group in  
21 several areas. Process, zero waste, sustainability,  
22 product stewardship, environmental justice language  
23 changes, environmentally preferential purchasing,  
24 conversion technology, and household chemicals.

25 I've described the process we have gone through

1 over the last three years to develop the focus and  
2 direction of this plan, and how we will be developing the  
3 implementation and monitoring process. If the Board has  
4 additional direction that they wish to give us on that,  
5 we would certainly be happy to incorporate that into our  
6 planning.

7 With respect to the suggestion that definitions  
8 of the sustainability and product -- that definitions of  
9 sustainability and product stewardship be included in the  
10 plan, staff agrees that it is a good idea to make what  
11 the Board means by these terms stand out more clearly in  
12 the document.

13 In the Board's draft plan, the introductory text  
14 under goal one of page nine of attachment one defines  
15 product stewardship as quote,

16 "The principle that ensures that  
17 all actors along the product chain  
18 share responsibility for life cycle  
19 environmental impacts and the  
20 financial viability of the whole  
21 product system."

22 Further, it calls for,

23 "Each actor in the life cycle of  
24 products and services to take  
25 voluntary actions to maximize



1 environmental, social, and economic  
2 performance, and to minimize  
3 environmental and health impacts  
4 through implementation of the  
5 interrelated principles of extended  
6 product responsibility, product  
7 stewardship, pollution prevention,  
8 and sustainable development."

9 This text was developed through the Board staff  
10 team that worked on this goal.

11 In the same section, sustainability is defined  
12 as quote,

13 "The global concept of meeting  
14 the needs of the present without  
15 compromising the ability of future  
16 generations to meet their own needs  
17 through the three E's; actions that  
18 are economically sound,  
19 environmentally restorative, and  
20 socially and generationally  
21 equitable."

22 If the Board wishes to revise these definitions  
23 in the plan or to expand them, staff has prepared a  
24 document to assist you in that discussion.

25 This handout lists a variety of definitions for

1 both product stewardship and sustainability from a  
2 variety of sources. And I think -- did you pass it out  
3 already? There are copies of this list at the back of  
4 the room as well, and some for executive staff as well.

5 We have these on slides as well on our Power  
6 Point presentation if that would be of assistance to you.

7 These are just additional language that, we took  
8 a look at a lot of organizations and companies that have  
9 incorporated these definitions into their own internal  
10 documents. And just in case you want to take a look at  
11 giving us direction to revise or expand the definitions  
12 that are in the plan already.

13 Lastly, in the area of environmental justice. In  
14 the Board's values there's a statement that indicates the  
15 Board's commitment to reducing or eliminating the  
16 disproportionate impacts of pollution on low income and  
17 minority populations.

18 In order to be clear and to address the concern  
19 of the Thursday Group that this statement assumes that  
20 there are disproportionate Impacts, we suggest that the  
21 Board could revise the statement to read quote,

22 "We are committed to reducing or  
23 eliminating any disproportionate  
24 impacts of pollution identified in  
25 any community, including low income

1                   and minority populations."

2                   The other areas I think, I believe some of the  
3   Board members wish to address some of the comments, so  
4   I'll leave my comments at that, and I'll be happy to  
5   answer any questions.

6                   BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON:   Okay.   Any  
7   questions from the Board at this time before we go to the  
8   speakers?

9                   Tim Shestek.

10                  MR. SHESTEK:   Good morning, Madam Chair and  
11   Board members.   Tim Shestek on behalf of the American  
12   Plastics Council and the Thursday Group.

13                  We appreciate the opportunity to share with you  
14   our comments regarding the 2001 strategic plan.

15                  Just by way of background, the Thursday Group is  
16   a broad coalition of business associations committed  
17   really to promoting public policies that share or strike  
18   a reasonable balance between economic growth and  
19   environmental protection.

20                  Our comments, which we did submit in detail on  
21   Friday, are really intended to strengthen what this  
22   document is intended to do by providing greater clarity  
23   and fostering an atmosphere of mutual participation.

24                  As was mentioned by Ms. Packard, we are  
25   suggesting that the process of implementing the strategic

1 plan in terms of the strategies be as open to public  
2 review and comment as feasible, with periodic reviews. I  
3 think we even suggested a possible annual review of the  
4 document to garner further public input.

5 In terms of sustainability and product  
6 stewardship, we are suggesting that the concept of  
7 sustainability be clearly defined, one that essentially  
8 takes into account both economic and environmental and  
9 community needs. Especially now at a time when this  
10 nation is facing hundreds of thousands of job losses.

11 Sustainability provides the business community  
12 with some assurances and with some clarity of the  
13 policies that will be enacted by this Board share a  
14 balance between economic needs and environmental  
15 protection.

16 In relative, in regards to product stewardship,  
17 we support that concept but feel a broader, more clearly  
18 defined definition, or working definition if you will, be  
19 included to apply to a variety of change of  
20 circumstances, a variety of processes, manufacturing  
21 processes and products; and one that would, that can be  
22 analyzed on a case by case basis.

23 I know some of my other colleagues are going to  
24 be commenting on the other comments that we did have, but  
25 I did want to stress to the Board that we truly do

1 appreciate the opportunity that we've been given over the  
2 last few weeks to put together some comments and some  
3 suggestions. They are in no way intended to disrupt the  
4 process of this strategic plan.

5 We welcome the strategic plan. We welcome our  
6 participation in this process. And I think if we are  
7 going to achieve a sustainable California, that will only  
8 be occurring with a development of partnerships that can  
9 protect the environment but also foster a positive  
10 business climate in the state.

11 Thank you.

12 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Tim.  
13 Brian White, California Chamber of Commerce.

14 MR. WHITE: Good morning, Chairman, Board  
15 members, and Board staff. My name is Brian White from  
16 the California Chamber of Commerce, Director of  
17 Environmental Issues.

18 The California Chamber represents 12,000  
19 businesses in all industry sectors, both large and small.  
20 A lot of them have been very active in solid waste  
21 reduction programs such as the rigid plastic packaging  
22 program and garbage container program, so we are very  
23 interested in continuing to participate in the programs  
24 that reduce solid waste, but as our previous speaker just  
25 spoke to, we want a balance and flexibility recognized

1 with that.

2 I won't go into the things that Tim has already  
3 mentioned, I just have some brief comments of how we  
4 envision the process continuing to play out.

5 First, the business community would like the  
6 opportunity to participate in whatever strategies and  
7 legislative proposal the Board plans in the year.

8 Earlier in the year Board staff mentioned there  
9 was an external advisory group that came here and  
10 suggested some suggestions on how the Board could move on  
11 in developing the strategic plan.

12 A lot of our members which are not involved in  
13 the daily routines of solid waste, or the regular  
14 meetings of the Solid Waste Board, would be very  
15 interested in knowing about these meetings and external  
16 advisory groups, and would like to participate in them,  
17 particularly some of our medium and smaller businesses  
18 that would likely be affected by whatever proposals are  
19 produced.

20 Maybe just something as simple as improving  
21 communication. I know Mr. Paparian and Mr. Medina, we  
22 had initial discussion about how we can do that. We  
23 appreciate the fact that you guys have recognized that,  
24 you know, we'd like to continue to improve those  
25 communication channels.

1               Second, we have asked that more clarity be given  
2   to some of the terms and concepts used in the strategic  
3   plan. Concepts such as zero waste, product stewardship,  
4   sustainability are all laudable goals, but without  
5   defining them or putting them in context it opens the  
6   doors to a wide range of opinions. And business members  
7   are concerned that with the blessing of the Board,  
8   whatever is adopted with the strategic plan, these are  
9   the concepts that will be used in the legislature to  
10   draft legislation without ensuring there is a direct  
11   clarity or definition for what these goals are.

12              The goals are very good suggestions, and in no  
13   way am I saying that one suggestion is better than the  
14   other that we can play off on.

15              Again, the key goal is to provide flexibility,  
16   that's all we're looking for is flexibility and balance.  
17   What's workable for large businesses is not as workable  
18   for smaller businesses.

19              Our third issue of environmental justice is one  
20   that this community takes very seriously. Over the last  
21   three years the business community has worked with the  
22   legislature and environmental groups to come up with a  
23   plan on how to deal with environmental justice.

24              Legislation was enacted three years ago which  
25   sets up a timeline for not only dealing with

1 environmental justice, just also defines environmental  
2 justice as protecting all peoples, regardless of race,  
3 including minority and low income populations.

4 So what we're concerned about is that the  
5 environmental justice definition in this document will be  
6 kind of conflicted with the state legislation and the  
7 statutory language the legislature enacted years ago.

8 We would hope that, Rubia just laid out a  
9 definition of environmental justice which seems a lot  
10 more consistent with what that statutory definition is,  
11 so we appreciate that.

12 Again, the business community has provided  
13 comments to be used in a constructive manner. We  
14 appreciate the staff for taking the time to hold off last  
15 month's hearing. We will continue to work on this  
16 process.

17 And as, I'd like to just make one final  
18 statement that the Thursday Group, it is a collective  
19 membership of various different industry groups in  
20 California. And as Tim mentioned, it is never our goal  
21 to try to derail a process or a legislative proposal or  
22 regulatory proposal, we always try to come to an  
23 agreement or a balance, and I think that's been reflected  
24 as we worked with the legislature over the last four  
25 years.



1                   Again, I thank you for your time.

2                   BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
3   White. We'll make sure the California Chamber of  
4   Commerce is on our list for stakeholders of any meetings.

5                   Jeff Sickenger, California Manufacturers and  
6   Technology Association.

7                   MR. SICKENGER: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board  
8   members.

9                   I think my colleagues have stolen most of my  
10   thunder here, and I don't want to waste your time by  
11   repeating things that have been said. But I would like  
12   to extend our appreciation on behalf of the California  
13   Manufacturers and Technology Association for being  
14   willing to extend the dialogue on strategic plan. And it  
15   sounds like we're making some progress here.

16                  I wanted to go a step further. Based on what I  
17   heard Ms. Packard express as the new bullet four under  
18   values describing environmental justice as, I'd like to  
19   take a look at the language, but it sounds like that  
20   language will solve the problem, that it addresses the  
21   concern.

22                  And I guess I'd just like to restate the notion  
23   that our members support the idea of having a strategic  
24   plan, having a guide that the Board and all of the  
25   stakeholders can refer to for prospective solid waste

1 management decisions and actions. And we appreciate  
2 being part of that process. And hopefully we can reach  
3 accommodation on the outstanding issues that we've been  
4 discussing.

5 Thank you.

6 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you very  
7 much.

8 Laurie Nelson.

9 MS. NELSON: Good morning, Madam Chair and  
10 members. I'm Laurie Nelson, I represent the Consumer  
11 Specialty Products Association which is an association of  
12 over 200 companies which manufacture, distribute, and  
13 sell consumer products which are widely used in  
14 California, as well as the Clorox Company. And I also  
15 appreciate the opportunity to provide our additional  
16 comments on the strategic plan.

17 We support the Thursday Group's suggested  
18 changes, but what I want to specifically focus on is our  
19 concern on page fourteen with objective three E.

20 And what that does is it says you want to,

21 "Provide grants to local  
22 governments to develop educational  
23 programs for children and adults in  
24 California regarding the dangers of  
25 household chemical products and

1           alternatives that may be available."

2           We have a long history on this issue, so I'd  
3   like to briefly review some of our key objections for  
4   those who are a little less familiar with this issue.

5           When used as directed, our products are safe and  
6   effective and, in fact, they clean, they disinfect, they  
7   protect our homes, schools, office buildings. They also  
8   play a very important role in the health of Californians.

9           I'm just going to give you one example. There  
10   was a rather recent example with the New England Journal  
11   of Medicine, and that study came out and they found the  
12   following:

13                    "That cockroaches are the most  
14                    common triggered inner-city asthma,  
15                    and children who live in roach  
16                    infested homes have the most severe  
17                    cases and, indeed, are three times  
18                    more likely to be hospitalized."

19           They found that, "Cockroaches cause about one  
20   quarter of all asthma in inner-city residences."

21           So that's just one of the benefits of some of  
22   our pesticidal products.

23           I'd also like to read some comments from the  
24   United States Environmental Protection Agency. And this  
25   has to do with their response to some of the local

1 government brochures that were being put out on safer  
2 substitutes. And I quote, they say,

3 "There are potential conflicts  
4 between the distribution of this  
5 material and the requirements of the  
6 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, or  
7 Rodenticide Act as well as state  
8 pesticide rules and regulations."

9 Under FIFRA, "Any chemical sold or distributed  
10 for control of a pest must be registered with EPA."

11 By making such recommendations, you are  
12 potentially putting individual chemicals, based on the  
13 information in your pamphlet, in the position of  
14 violating FIFRA.

15 And then finally, "It's unlawful to use a  
16 pesticide in a manner inconsistent with its labeled  
17 directions."

18 I would then like to add to the comments of the  
19 San Francisco Poison Control Center, and this is again  
20 comments on some of the brochures and pamphlets that were  
21 out there. I'm just going to pick and choose.

22 "Disturbed by the presence of  
23 numerous inaccuracies and impractical  
24 advice, this document appears to  
25 perpetuate a fundamental

1           misunderstanding about hazardous  
2           substances, namely that any dose is  
3           potentially toxic. The majority of  
4           the products listed in the document  
5           are considered by Poison Control  
6           Centers to create little or no risk  
7           of poisoning.

8                 "I find the brochure generally  
9           misleading and frequently inaccurate.  
10          It unfairly suggests that many of the  
11          common commercial household products  
12          in every day use are unsafe and  
13          should be replaced by alternatives  
14          which, in many cases, are unproved in  
15          efficacy and safety.

16                "It would be more appropriate to  
17          provide more detailed instructions on  
18          the appropriate use of existing  
19          products, including specific  
20          information about possible hazards  
21          and precautions for use and  
22          disposal."

23                Just to add to that, the Washington Poison  
24          Center has also weighed in.

25                "We and other poison centers do

1 recognize increasing problems with  
2 well-intended but sometimes mistaken  
3 advice given to the general public  
4 about helpful substitutes to many of  
5 these commercial products.

6 Occasionally the substitute itself  
7 may pose a significant poison risk,  
8 and it may not be appropriately  
9 labeled in its container, and the  
10 container itself may not be child  
11 resistant."

12 And then finally I'd just like to read from the  
13 California Environmental Protection Agency's own, their  
14 own household hazardous waste source reduction policy.

15 "Cal EPA requires that all  
16 public education information material  
17 prepared directly by a California EPA  
18 Board, office, or department, shall  
19 be based on relevant and accurate  
20 information. Public education  
21 informational material should be  
22 clearly -- should clearly identify  
23 any significant effects posed by use  
24 of a substitute chemical formulation  
25 or product on human health and the

1 environment.

2 "Any comparative claims or  
3 statements of efficacy shall be  
4 substantiated by reliable evidence.  
5 Any recommendation made for the use  
6 of substances for pesticidal purposes  
7 shall be consistent with state and  
8 federal laws and regulations  
9 pertaining to pesticide regulation.

10 "Any public education  
11 informational material not jointly  
12 prepared by a department, office, or  
13 Board shall be reviewed by any  
14 affected department, office, or Board  
15 prior to the public dissemination."

16 So in light of this we would respectfully  
17 request that this paragraph be deleted, and we'd like to  
18 work with the Board in partnership on information, public  
19 service announcements, on safe use of our products, on  
20 safe disposal of our products.

21 We do have numerous efforts underway which we've  
22 talked with some of you about, and we welcome the Board's  
23 participation in that.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Ms. Nelson.

1                   Mark Murray, Californians Against Waste.

2                   MR. MURRAY: Thank you very much, Madam Chair,  
3 members of the Board. I'm Mark Murray, I'm the Executive  
4 Director of Californians Against Waste.

5                   I do have a letter that articulates some  
6 comments on the strategic plan, and I'll just get you to  
7 pass that out. I think I've got a member for -- fifteen  
8 letters total, so how's that?

9                   I want to start off by saying that we really  
10 greatly appreciate the openness and inclusiveness that  
11 the Board has demonstrated in preparing the strategic  
12 plan. We participated back, it's hard to say how long  
13 ago it was in terms of that strategic plan that Mr. Jones  
14 and Mr. Eaton kind of took the lead in putting together.

15                  And I actually do recall representatives of the  
16 Thursday Group, representatives of the so-called Thursday  
17 Group being there. So I think that if there may be a  
18 communication problem it may be internal within the  
19 Thursday Group as opposed to a communication problem  
20 between the Board. In fact, I recall disagreeing with  
21 members of some of those representatives at those forums.  
22 I.

23                  Want to say that generally we support the  
24 direction and the recommendations in the strategic plan.  
25 We do have some suggestions for bolstering and clarifying



1 elements of that plan, and I want to highlight some of  
2 those areas where we support the plan as well as some  
3 suggestions that we have.

4 First off, the area of zero waste. The private  
5 sector has long recognized the value of promoting and  
6 aiming for zero waste, be it zero material waste, zero  
7 emissions. This is not a new concept, and this is not  
8 something that was invented recently. This is something  
9 the private sector really has brought to the forefront,  
10 and it's great to see a government agency really  
11 embracing that concept as something that we aim for.

12 Now I'd like to suggest that we be a little bit  
13 more ambitious in terms of what we are proposing in terms  
14 of zero waste. But certainly it's hard to imagine why  
15 someone would be objecting to pursuing, to aiming for  
16 zero waste. I'm not sure how much waste they're for if  
17 they're not, if they're against zero waste.

18 I want to, we also understand that it's likely  
19 that there are some problem materials out there,  
20 particularly plastic packaging, plastic waste, that's not  
21 going to get to zero waste. But simply because one  
22 individual material can't achieve that high level of  
23 material recovery, we shouldn't lower the bar for every  
24 other material.

25 The second area that I wanted to talk about is

1 product stewardship and manufacturer responsibility.

2 Again, this isn't a new idea. We have legislation on the  
3 books today in California that the Board is responsible  
4 for implementing that puts forward the idea of  
5 manufacturer responsibility.

6 This Board has been a real leader in terms of  
7 advancing the idea of product stewardship, sometimes, in  
8 fact, kind of some of the voluntary aspects of product  
9 stewardship the Board has pursued sometimes over our  
10 objections. In many respects we feel that manufacturers  
11 need to have their feet held to the fire.

12 In terms of the need for manufacturer  
13 responsibility. Right now our solid waste recycling  
14 infrastructure for the most part falls on the vast local  
15 government and they're dealing with material collection  
16 at the back end. And we recognize that as packaging and  
17 other materials that become solid waste ultimately, as  
18 they continued to evolve, local government has very  
19 little ability to change that, those waste streams  
20 because they're at the back end.

21 We need to have manufacturers sharing in that  
22 responsibility so that they have, they have an economic  
23 interest in both reducing the hazardousness of that  
24 waste, the volume of that waste, as well as making sure  
25 that that waste can then be brought back into the

1 marketplace.

2           That's not something that the local government  
3 can do, that's not something the Integrated Waste  
4 Management Board can do, that's something that only the  
5 manufacturers of this material and these products can do.  
6 And that's why we have to have their, that sharing in  
7 this responsibility, either in a voluntary product  
8 stewardship mode, or in a mandatory mode as we have in  
9 the minimum recycled content laws both for newsprint,  
10 plastic, and other materials.

11           Assistance in creation and expansion of  
12 sustainable markets, this was your goal number two. This  
13 is one area where the Board has been an absolute leader  
14 in terms of recognizing the need to develop markets for  
15 recycled material, and you don't need to look any further  
16 really than this building to see where this Board has  
17 taken the lead in terms of recognizing the value of, the  
18 importance of using recycled materials and other  
19 environmentally preferable materials.

20           I'm sorry Mr. Eaton isn't here today, but  
21 certainly his leadership in having green technologies and  
22 environmentally preferable products used in this building  
23 certainly have made a difference in it, and really I  
24 think represent a model for other buildings throughout  
25 the state.

1           This Board has also been a leader in educating  
2   the public, educating K through twelve students, and this  
3   is another area where we support the, what's in the  
4   strategic plan, maybe could have a little bit of  
5   modification.

6           Based on the successful track record that this  
7   Board has had in supporting education, we want to support  
8   the proposed strategy of providing grants to local  
9   governments and others to develop educational programs  
10   for children and consumers regarding public health and  
11   environmental hazards posed by toxic household chemicals  
12   while promoting the use of effective alternatives.

13          The one modification, this focuses on grants for  
14   local governments. We think that there are other  
15   entities, non-profit organizations that could do an  
16   equally good job in identifying the hazards posed by  
17   these products, as well as suggesting alternatives.

18          The disposal of toxic household chemicals is one  
19   of the primary sources of hazardous wastes in our  
20   landfills, and it's a very appropriate target of the  
21   Integrated Waste Management Board.

22          Finally, I want to talk about the commitment to  
23   environmental justice. We strongly support the plan's  
24   language underscoring the Board's commitment to  
25   environmental justice. We also supported it when it was

1 in the Cal EPA plan.

2 We urge the Board to reject the proposed changes  
3 in this section from the California Chamber of Commerce  
4 and the California Manufacturers Association. To  
5 compromise this Board's, and frankly this  
6 administration's commitment to environmental justice.

7 Now we recognize that this is a, this is a  
8 consensus plan, it's the product of lots of meetings,  
9 lots of discussions, and so we don't expect it to be our  
10 plan in terms of reflective of what we might have in a  
11 plan.

12 But I did want to identify a couple of areas  
13 that we've mentioned at the beginning of the process and  
14 that we're going to continue to mention as this plan goes  
15 into implementation, and I'd be remiss if I didn't  
16 mention them.

17 Number one is we're looking at specific  
18 strategies for achieving the objectives that are in this  
19 plan. We think it's important for the Board to look at  
20 the development and promotion of advance disposal fees  
21 for specific problem products. Specific problem products  
22 like paints, like plastics, like electronics waste.

23 Bans on the disposal of specific problem  
24 products. And these are materials that either create  
25 disproportionate hazards or problems in the solid waste

1 stream, unnecessarily burdening from an economic and  
2 environmental standpoint, that system. That includes  
3 tires, all household -- all hazardous waste. We should  
4 be banning all hazardous waste from the landfill, not  
5 just if they come from industry, if they come from  
6 households; whatever their sources, if they've got any  
7 amount of hazardous waste they don't belong in our solid  
8 waste landfills.

9           And third, I think really a case can be made,  
10 particularly in light of what's happening in Southern  
11 California with the Air Quality District, I think we  
12 should refocus that district away from scrutinizing the  
13 composting industry and more towards the green waste  
14 that's continuing to go to landfill, and looking at  
15 actually banning the disposal of green waste in  
16 landfills.

17           And thirdly, aggressive implementation of the  
18 state's existing state agency recycling policies, both in  
19 terms of implementing recycling policies as well as on  
20 the purchase and the use of recycled and other  
21 environmentally preferential products.

22           So we have additions that we'd like to see in  
23 this plan, but at the same time we recognize this isn't  
24 the details, this isn't the specific blueprint, this is a  
25 vision document, and as such we strongly support the

1 document and we urge its quick implementation.

2 Thanks a lot.

3 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Murray.

4 We have Bill Magavern of the Sierra Club, followed by our  
5 last speaker, Gary Liss.

6 MR. MAGAVERN: Good morning, I'm Bill Magavern  
7 with the Sierra Club.

8 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Sorry, Magavern.

9 MR. MAGAVERN: Thank you for the opportunity --  
10 this is the first time that I've been here. Thank you  
11 for the opportunity to speak before you on the strategic  
12 plan.

13 I congratulate the Board on the strategic plan.  
14 I think it's a very useful framework for your work.

15 In particular, the goal of zero waste is a very  
16 important one to include in this plan, and I certainly  
17 urge you to keep it in there and not to heed the  
18 objections coming from the plastics industry.

19 The Board might consider putting a little more  
20 teeth into the goal by adding a deadline for California  
21 to achieve the goal of zero waste. Similarly, the  
22 concept of extended product responsibility is a very  
23 important one, and we certainly support its inclusion in  
24 the plan.

25 Again, if we were writing it we would probably

1 add more teeth to it with specific bans and requirements  
2 and advance disposal fees of the sort that Mark Murray  
3 has outlined, but you are certainly advancing the concept  
4 and are starting to move in the right direction with  
5 this.

6 Similarly, I know that the Board has recently  
7 been really taking very seriously the issue of  
8 environmental justice. And this strategic plan really  
9 recognizing that. And we strongly support that.

10 And I think it would be a very bad idea to water  
11 down the language that you have in there now,  
12 particularly because that language is exactly the same as  
13 the environmental justice language in Cal EPA's strategic  
14 vision document.

15 And certainly you want to have consistency  
16 within the agency, and the Cal EPA strategic vision, like  
17 your plan, recognizes that there have been  
18 well-documented and demonstrated through numerous studies  
19 disproportionate impacts on low-income communities and  
20 communities of color.

21 Cal EPA took that into account, you did also.  
22 You know, we should not blind ourselves to that reality,  
23 and therefore I would urge that the, even the changes  
24 that the staff has recommended not be adopted and that  
25 you stick with the language that's consistent with Cal



1 EPA.

2 And in fact, I hope that this Board will go  
3 further and seek the authority to deny permits when there  
4 is demonstrated that there will be a disproportionate  
5 impact on low-income communities and communities of  
6 color, because that would really be putting the  
7 environmental justice principles into action.

8 Also support the idea of the educational  
9 campaign on household hazardous products. I think  
10 possibly to make sure that there is no misperception that  
11 unsafe alternatives could be advanced by this campaign,  
12 you might want to simply add the word "safe" in front of  
13 alternatives to make it clear that when you do education  
14 about possible alternatives you would only want to  
15 promote safe alternatives, not just any alternatives to  
16 household hazardous products.

17 Certainly we support the Board's recognition of  
18 environmentally preferable products and practices, and  
19 the intention to advance those as you're doing at this  
20 building and throughout your work.

21 So we certainly urge the adoption of this  
22 strategic plan, and look forward to continuing to work  
23 with the Board on its implementation.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Gary Liss,

1 and we do have one late speaker slip, Alison Hudson. Oh,  
2 I guess we have more late speaker slips.

3 MR. LISS: Madam Chair and members of the Board,  
4 I appreciate the opportunity to speak here today. I'd  
5 like to echo the comments made by Mark Murray and Bill  
6 before me on supporting the plan as it has been presented  
7 to you at this time.

8 I'm particularly speaking on behalf of the  
9 issues of zero waste, impact responsibility, product  
10 stewardship, environmentally preferable purchasing,  
11 environmental justice, issues that were addressed by the  
12 Thursday Group requesting changes in addition to the  
13 leadership that you're trying to provide, and I'd like to  
14 speak on behalf of those terms being included as they  
15 were written.

16 First of all, my primary emphasis is on zero  
17 waste which will provide us a vision in moving towards  
18 all the efforts that are also being talked about in terms  
19 of product stewardship. And I'd like to clear up some  
20 ideas about what zero waste is and what it's not. It's  
21 not a hundred percent recycling; it's twice AB 939; it's  
22 not putting more burdens on people; it's looking at the  
23 system to find out where we are wasting, where we're  
24 being inefficient in our system, and trying to reduce  
25 waste and improve efficiency and make our economy a more

1 sustainable economy.

2           The World Business Council of Sustainable  
3 Development, which is 150 international companies whose  
4 leaders believe that the pursuit of sustainable  
5 development is good for enterprises, the planet, and its  
6 people, highlights that pursuing a mission of sustainable  
7 development can make our firms more competitive, more  
8 resilient to shocks, nimbler in a fast changing world,  
9 more unified in purpose, more likely to attract and hold  
10 customers and the best employees, and more at ease with  
11 regulators, banks, insurers, and financial markets.

12           They noted in a report that was just released  
13 that I provided to some of the staff yesterday, that  
14 during the five years before August, 2001, the Dow Jones  
15 Sustainability Index clearly outperformed the Dow Jones  
16 global index with an annualized return of 15.8 percent  
17 compared to a 12.5 percent for the global index for that  
18 same period.

19           The sustainability index consists of the top ten  
20 percent of companies, and 68 industry groups in 21  
21 countries seen as leaders in sustainable developments.

22           What their message is is that progressive  
23 companies are leading the way to the sustainable economy  
24 of the future. And your support for zero waste and the  
25 sustainability practices and product stewardship issues

1 will help move Californians there.

2 They further note that,

3 "Companies that do not reflect  
4 their people's best vision and values  
5 and their actions will wither in the  
6 marketplace in the long term."

7 We ask that you provide leadership in California  
8 to not only sustain our economy but also to grow our  
9 economy.

10 The National Recycling Coalition in a recent  
11 report that reads,

12 "Recycling economic information  
13 project" highlighted that, "Recycling  
14 industry employees, 1.1 million  
15 people nationwide, gendering an  
16 annual payroll of \$37 billion,  
17 grossing \$236 billion dollars in  
18 annual sales is comparable to the  
19 size of the auto and truck  
20 manufacturing industry."

21 What we're talking about in recycling and zero  
22 waste is moving to more jobs, a more sustainable economy,  
23 and a economy that can grow in the future.

24 Zero waste is a policy, it's a path, it's a  
25 direction, a target, and a way of thinking. It's moving

1 from waste management to resource management.

2 It's recognizing that for every ton that's  
3 disposed of in landfills, 71 tons are disposed along the  
4 way in mining, manufacturing, oil and gas exploration,  
5 and coal combustion.

6 It recognizes that we're dealing with waste at  
7 the front end, not dealing with the by-products of the  
8 system at the back end.

9 And it's like many other zero goals, as Mark  
10 Murray highlighted, like zero emissions for air and  
11 water, zero defects for total quantity management, zero  
12 inventory, just in time inventory, practices that have  
13 been adopted by businesses throughout the world.

14 It's comparable to sustainable agricultural,  
15 sustainable forestry, sustainable cities.

16 The issue of zero waste is the direction that we  
17 need to move in for the waste and resource management  
18 industry.

19 Zero waste, what does it mean? It means  
20 businesses sharing responsibilities for products and  
21 packaging.

22 It means focusing on delivering services, not  
23 products.

24 It means providing more services with less  
25 energy and material.

1           It means designing waste out of the system.

2           Zero waste means incentives to harness the  
3 forces of the marketplace;

4           To tax bads and not goods;

5           And to eliminate waste, not manage it.

6           To find a home for everything, and preferably a  
7 local one.

8           It means developing resource recovery parks.

9           It means involving the community with  
10 environmental justice concerns and corporate social  
11 responsibilities.

12           It means environmentally preferable purchasing  
13 and ending subsidies for waste.

14           Zero waste requires new rules for businesses.

15           The reason we need product stewardship,  
16 manufacturer responsibility and similar concepts is  
17 because businesses react to the rules of the marketplace.  
18 We need to give rules which will give them the price  
19 signals and policies that will make the eco-efficient  
20 systems that we all want for our society.

21           We can do that through land use permit  
22 conditions, by requirements in recycling plants, by  
23 asking businesses to achieve recycling goals.

24           We need to do more in terms of requirements and  
25 incentives. ADF's on problem products like Mark and Bill

1 talked about for paint, plastics, electronic waste.

2 We need to do more on bans, retail, like mercury  
3 thermometers have been done in San Francisco and  
4 Minnesota.

5 We need to have more landfill bans of particular  
6 products.

7 And we need to work with businesses to take back  
8 their products and packaging as we're now doing with  
9 electronic waste in particular.

10 Is zero waste an attainable goal? It seems way  
11 beyond our capacity. Well businesses are the ones that  
12 are pioneering this and proving that zero waste is in  
13 fact practical.

14 Businesses that are diverting over 90 percent of  
15 their waste already are Hewlett Packard in Roseville,  
16 Xerox Corporation nationally, Pillsbury Corporation,  
17 Fetzer vineyards, Mad River Brewing Company, Del Mar  
18 Fairgrounds, Collins and Aikman Carpet Company, Zanker  
19 Road Landfill.

20 Many companies are striving for zero waste. And  
21 the grass roots recycling network considers the goal of  
22 zero waste to be attainable or darn close is their  
23 message.

24 And there are many groups that are working  
25 towards sustainability like the Future 500, Natural Step,

1 Global Futures, Natural Strategies, the World Business  
2 Council for Sustainable Development. There are many  
3 businesses that recognize and value the future direction  
4 of sustainability and zero waste, and we urge you to keep  
5 your leadership on that issue.

6 Governments are on their way to zero waste.  
7 Seattle, Washington has adopted zero waste as a guiding  
8 principle on the path to sustainability of their solid  
9 waste plan in 1998.

10 Del Norte County, California, was the first  
11 county in the nation to adopt a zero waste plan.

12 Santa Cruz County, San Luis Obispo County,  
13 California, have adopted zero waste goals.

14 One-third of New Zealand cities have adopted  
15 zero waste goals.

16 And Canberra, Australia was the first to adopt  
17 zero waste by 2010 many years ago.

18 And Halifax, Nova Scotia are examples of  
19 governments on their way to zero waste.

20 Will it cost more? No, because zero waste is  
21 not looking at a centralized public works project with  
22 diminishing returns as the Thursday Group seems to  
23 misunderstand.

24 Businesses are actually the beneficiaries of  
25 zero waste because they will save money through product



1 and process improvements, redesigns of their activities,  
2 and through more recycling. In fact, the job creation  
3 potential that I highlighted earlier highlights the  
4 benefits of recycling and zero waste for our economy.

5 What if we don't design for zero waste?

6 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Mr. Liss, I'm going to  
7 have to ask you to come to a conclusion because we have  
8 more speakers, and our Board members would like to speak,  
9 and we have a 1:30 budget meeting.

10 MR. LISS: Okay.

11 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

12 MR. LISS: In conclusion, zero waste is the  
13 future; product stewardship, manufacturer responsibility,  
14 and environmental preferable purchasing, and  
15 environmental justice are all critical components of  
16 that.

17 We urge you to keep those in as written in the  
18 strategic plan.

19 Thank you for the openness and inclusiveness of  
20 the process. And urge those who feel they weren't able  
21 to participate to check out your website, one of the most  
22 comprehensive in the world being used all over the world  
23 for this information. And with the list serve mechanism  
24 on it to let anyone be notified of all of the meetings  
25 that you have is an awesome way of getting informed. I

1     urge our colleagues to get informed themselves.

2             Thank you.

3             BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
4     Liss.

5             Alison Hudson followed by Evan Edgar.

6             MS. HUDSON: Good morning, Board members and  
7     Board staff. I waited until the end hoping that someone  
8     else would get up and speak for the locals but it looks  
9     like I'm it.

10            MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: You're it.

11            MS. HUDSON: Yes. I'm with San Joaquin County  
12     Department of Public Works. I work for the Solid Waste  
13     Division, and I'm responsible for the source reduction  
14     and the planning for San Joaquin County. And that  
15     includes the oil programs, HHW programs, and the  
16     diversion programs, recycling programs, composting  
17     programs.

18            We have been on the front lines. We're your  
19     foot soldiers addressing these issues at the local level.  
20     And we have been addressing the issues that you are, and  
21     discussing the issues that are in the strategic plan, and  
22     I'm here to generally support the direction that you're  
23     taking.

24            I want to speak specifically to extended product  
25     responsibility because it is extremely painful for us at

1     this very moment.

2                 I pulled one of our sheets, this is just a local  
3     sheet of the invoices that we've paid since, from the  
4     last week in July, we do two shipments a week,  
5     eighteen-wheeler twice a week, that costs about \$4,500  
6     every time we do them which is \$9,000 a week. And just  
7     at one of our facilities to date from August, the end of  
8     August to the last week in October, we've spent \$57,425,  
9     and that's at one facility.

10                So we are extremely interested in extended  
11     product responsibility and extended producer  
12     responsibility.

13                And I'd like to point out that I really, we're  
14     not terribly interested in sharing the costs of the  
15     disposal for these products. We think that the  
16     manufacturers who are making a profit off of these  
17     products should take responsibility at the front end for  
18     addressing the problems that are costing us thousands of  
19     dollars.

20                The CRT issue. And our CRTs are worth nothing,  
21     they can't be turned back in, they're all old. I mean  
22     we're not even to the point where people are turning in  
23     new computers, we're looking at old televisions, at the  
24     legacy piles that are worth nothing. And we know that  
25     we're going to be at the \$300,000 level by the time the,

1 by the time actually June rolls around again, we'll be at  
2 the \$300,000 level or past that.

3 And finally, I just do want to say that in terms  
4 of education, because we do reuse programs and we are out  
5 there educating the public about household hazardous  
6 waste collection and disposal, our focus is on reduced  
7 toxicity not so much alternative products that are  
8 homemade such as baking powder. And I don't think you'll  
9 see any of the jurisdictions out there, you know, handing  
10 out toothbrushes and vinegar.

11 What you're going to see is jurisdictions like  
12 mine trying to teach people how to read labels, to show  
13 people what labels -- what those words on the labels  
14 mean, and to give them alternative products that are  
15 being produced and that are being tested that are of  
16 reduced toxicity. And so we would like support at the  
17 local level for those efforts.

18 Basically I tried to convince a mother of four  
19 young children that she really maybe doesn't want to use  
20 slug bait, and maybe there's an alternative corn gluten  
21 or some other product that would be less hazardous  
22 potentially and less accident prone.

23 Thank you very much.

24 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

25 Evan Edgar.

1 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Madam Chair.

2 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes, Mr.  
3 Paparian.

4 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Just briefly. Thank you  
5 for your presentation. And I just wanted to say that San  
6 Joaquin County is not noted as a hotbed of radical waste  
7 activities.

8 MS. HUDSON: No, we're a very conservative  
9 community.

10 BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: But I do note that one  
11 of the manufacturers in your area, American Molding and  
12 Millwork Company, the manufacturing association might  
13 want to seek them out as a possible member, has a zero  
14 waste manufacturing policy. And I think is an example of  
15 perhaps a number of companies throughout California that  
16 have quietly moved in this direction.

17 MS. HUDSON: Thank you.

18 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you. Evan Edgar.

19 MR. EDGAR: Madam Chair, Board members. My name  
20 is Evan Edgar, Edgar Associates on behalf of the  
21 California Refuse Removal Council, one hundred member  
22 companies and fifty MRFs and transfer stations.

23 We go back about three generations. Some of our  
24 companies are still called salvage companies, Turlock  
25 Scavenger, South San Francisco Scavenger.

1           The reason I say that is because we've been  
2   doing this for over a hundred years, how to design a  
3   program once it gets dumped on us. And product  
4   stewardship is a key issue for us.

5           Back in the eighties, early nineties we had the  
6   old household hazardous waste, the used oil, batteries,  
7   used tires were banned, Freon from refrigerators. We  
8   moved into some light goods, fluorescent goods, CRTs,  
9   universal waste, E scrap. And what happens is our  
10   industry has to do a makeshift program with little or no  
11   funding on the fly, and we have to make it work, and we  
12   do.

13          Eventually we may get grants and we may get  
14   local funding and we may get some type of user fee to  
15   kind of make it a better program, so we've been used to  
16   having to deal with all the bans that happen, and we  
17   would endorse some type of product stewardship to share  
18   the responsibility, because right now the responsibility  
19   is on local government to help fund the program; it is on  
20   the consumers; but it's up to the solid waste managers at  
21   the MRFs and at the transfer stations in order to make it  
22   worse.

23          So we would endorse a visionary statement and  
24   some type of program for product stewardship such as for  
25   green procurement as well.

1               We believe that the compost specs by Caltrans  
2   and different types of green building procurements  
3   standards are great, and we would endorse that.

4               CRRC supports the 50 percent goal, we always  
5   have. But we need a vision to get us to the next goal.  
6   It may seem impossible, it may raise the bar, but we need  
7   to move beyond the zero subgame of status quo, and move  
8   to something that's visionary in order to get us to the  
9   next goal.

10              And so we support the strategic plan and look  
11   forward to working with the Waste Board.

12              Thank you.

13              BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr.  
14   Edgar.

15              And that concludes our public comments. I  
16   really appreciate everybody coming. And I know the Board  
17   members do want to speak, but I do want to thank the  
18   public for expressing their different perspectives.

19              Our court reporter does need a short break, so  
20   we're going to take a very short break right now, and  
21   then we'll be back and conclude our discussion with our  
22   Board members.

23              (Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

24              BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to get  
25   started again, please.

1                   Again, thank you to the speakers, and now I'd  
2   like to open it up to Board members.

3                   Mr. Medina.

4                   BOARD MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5                   First I'd like to start out by saying that it  
6   was an outstanding effort that took place over an  
7   extended period of time in putting together the strategic  
8   plan. I know that there was ample participation, both  
9   with internal and external stakeholders. And I think the  
10  greatest challenge you face in any strategic plan is you  
11  may have the best language in the world but it really  
12  comes down to an implementation, so I think that's the  
13  real commitment.

14                  The meetings, just from my observation, were  
15  more than adequately noticed. And from last week's  
16  meeting with the Thursday Group, and I welcome their  
17  comments and assure they'll be taken into consideration  
18  as we move into our meeting in regards to the strategic  
19  plan.

20                  The, I have to say that the, in crafting the  
21  environmental justice language that I know that staff and  
22  the Board members to make it strong, we made certain that  
23  it was in, carefully read in regards to the state  
24  statutes in developing the language, and also consistent  
25  with Cal EPA language.



1           As far as objective three from the objective  
2   three E from our meeting with the Thursday Group, I think  
3   we share some agreement in regard to better use of some  
4   language; for example, rather than using the word, "The  
5   dangers of household chemical products," change that to,  
6   "Proper use of chemical, proper use of chemical  
7   products." I think that was one of the things we  
8   discussed in the meeting.

9           But overall I think that, you know, there was  
10   very significant effort by all involved in the strategic  
11   plan and I looked forward to the implementation of the  
12   plan.

13           MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

14           Mr. Jones.

15           BOARD MEMBER JONES: Thanks, Madam Chair.

16           I think I would agree with Mr. Medina on that  
17   change on the language of three E. I will say as, maybe  
18   looking at it from a different standpoint, the material  
19   when it's half full in a bottle goes into a garbage truck  
20   as a safe product, mixes with another product, becomes  
21   volatile product. And that's how people get hurt, and  
22   that's how people get killed.

23           And so I think to do a simple, you know,  
24   categorization that they have to be safe, they are safe  
25   as a singular product, it's when they mix that creates a

1 real hazard.

2 And I don't know how many of you saw your  
3 grandmothers or maybe your mothers wash a stove with some  
4 kind of a chlorine based cleaner and mixing ammonia with  
5 it, that makes ammonia gas, chlorine gas that you can die  
6 from. Those are the types of things that I think we have  
7 an obligation to make sure that we don't offer everybody  
8 carte blanche on alternative methods.

9 I mean we have to educate people so that they  
10 don't die. And that's happened since the Tanner Bill and  
11 all the work we've done with household hazardous waste  
12 and information, and I wouldn't want to see that thrown  
13 away.

14 I've got friends and people that work for me  
15 that got hurt drastically because people threw stuff away  
16 that they shouldn't have.

17 So I think we need to work on that, on that  
18 language a little bit on three E to determine that there  
19 are some alternatives out there that are better, but it  
20 can't just be, there aren't alternatives for everything,  
21 and when you start mixing products you create real  
22 disaster.

23 The other thing I think we need to do, staff's  
24 done a real good job I think, or have thought about  
25 definitions. When we had our first workshop, Gary gave

1 pretty much the same presentation at that meeting that he  
2 gave today, I was thinking it was very familiar. But he  
3 had twelve slides defining what zero waste is. And that  
4 was why it didn't belong in the mission or the, or the  
5 vision statement as zero waste but sustainability,  
6 because it's a subjective term.

7           And if you look as industry at what zero waste,  
8 the benefits of zero waste to the manufacturing industry  
9 and to consumers, it is, it's not creating waste, it's  
10 being smarter about the way you work; it's about  
11 designing packaging that limits the amount of packaging  
12 but still safely manages a product or protects a product;  
13 and it does it with less material, and it does it  
14 smarter; it may be less expensive.

15           And those are the times, I mean we had a huge  
16 packaging workshop down in San Jose a couple, three  
17 years, three years ago, four years ago, and we offered  
18 that. And the California Manufacturers Association, Jack  
19 Stewart was one of our keynotes, because even though we  
20 had members that were in certain packaging businesses, he  
21 understood, as did a lot of people, that if you're  
22 smarter about the way that you make a product and package  
23 that product, that it can affect the bottom line.

24           I was interviewed -- I'm going to do this  
25 quickly because I know everybody wants to eat.

1           I was interviewed yesterday by the plastics news  
2   who could not understand why I was, why I appreciated the  
3   idea of zero waste.

4           And I talked about the fact that zero waste  
5   needs to look at conversion technology. We need to look  
6   at pyrolysis. We need to look at gasification. We need  
7   to look at that part of the waste stream that doesn't  
8   have ready markets and figure out how to use it to get  
9   clean fuels, to get energy.

10          We're in an energy crisis. We're dependent on,  
11   on places that we don't necessarily want to be dependent  
12   on. So our waste streams can become feedstocks to help  
13   us in an energy crisis.

14          This Board has commissioned a conversion  
15   technology workshop. That's how I envision zero waste,  
16   being smarter, figure out what the next step is. And I  
17   have to tell you, they asked me about product stewardship  
18   in this interview, and my responsibility, and I had to  
19   remind the person, in 1989 when the legislation was being  
20   discussed about AB 939, it was based on premises of  
21   advance disposal fees.

22          So this is not a new concept. I'm not  
23   necessarily promoting that, but I am saying that you  
24   don't leave the bar in the middle.

25          We have achieved and built an infrastructure

1     that's incredible. The next step is how do we get smart  
2     about that other piece? Because you can't recycle one  
3     hundred percent of a waste stream, you just can't.

4             So how do we make people think about what's good  
5     for their business and what's good for the environment?  
6     And I think we do it in this document.

7             But we do need to make definitions. We need to  
8     have a section of this strategic plan that defines  
9     sustainability, zero waste, however we want to debate it.  
10    So that there, so that I don't want to see our proposal  
11    for the state of landfills in the State of California,  
12    our two year project where we said, "Let's get a good  
13    handle on exactly what's going on in all the landfills,"  
14    and that got used against us that nobody knew what the  
15    heck the state of the landfills were.

16            So I think we owe it to ourselves to learn from  
17    the past, and include definitions that we can all discuss  
18    and agree on, and get enough consensus so that we've got  
19    a basis for what the strategic plan is.

20            And I also want to congratulate all the Board  
21    members, staff, Rubia, all your exec -- I mean, Mark, all  
22    your executive team. This is a good document and you've  
23    done a good job.

24            Thanks.

25            MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Steve.

1                   Mike.

2                   BOARD MEMBER PAPARIAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3                   First of all, I wanted to thank and welcome the  
4 business community to these discussions. Some of the  
5 folks we haven't seen on a regular basis.

6                   I think as we move forward in the future,  
7 working with the business community is going to be really  
8 key to addressing a lot of the waste problems that we  
9 face.

10                  In fact, I'm going tomorrow morning to meet with  
11 one of the Thursday Group members, and at that meeting  
12 I'm going to be congratulating three of their members for  
13 their good work on solid waste recycling and source  
14 reduction.

15                  I think we may have some common ground here,  
16 I'll get to that in a second. But I did want to focus on  
17 this zero waste thing. I appreciate Mr. Jones' comments  
18 on zero waste, we had a lot of give and take on this as  
19 we debated this over the past year or so.

20                  But zero is not an uncommon concept in the  
21 business community. I know that Dow Chemical talks about  
22 a vision of zero, zero accidents, zero injuries, no  
23 environmental harm. Raytheon talks about, CMTA Board  
24 members talks about zero defects. Conoco talks about  
25 zero injuries and zero lost work days.

1           I think in some of these, you know, in some of  
2   these things I think the companies are realistic in that  
3   they know they're not going to have zero in a lot of  
4   these areas, but they know that's the vision, and that's  
5   the concept that they want to get across to their  
6   employees.

7           And, you know, Dupont, who is an APC member, has  
8   a goal of zero injuries, zero illnesses, and zero  
9   incidences.

10          I could go on and on with that, but let me talk  
11   about, for a second about some of the companies that  
12   actually deal with zero waste, and actually talk about  
13   zero waste in various forums.

14          I found it interesting the LeMoore Naval Air  
15   station, some of us know where that is down in the  
16   Central Valley, talks about zero waste in their  
17   discussion of their Non-industrial Installation Pollution  
18   Prevention Award that they received last year.

19          The City of Burbank received an award from the  
20   California League of Cities for its zero waste program.

21          The City of Walnut in their recycling guide for  
22   businesses talks about zero waste.

23          A number of businesses, RICO, with offices in  
24   Orange County, was very proud and actually put out some  
25   press releases earlier this year that their Irvine,

1 Tustin, and Santa Ana facilities have achieved zero waste  
2 to landfill.

3 Texas Instruments, though not a California  
4 company, talks about zero waste of resources, and  
5 actually got an award in 1997, an award for environmental  
6 excellence from then Governor George Bush.

7 Mitsubishi has a goal of achieving zero waste in  
8 all their facilities.

9 Toyota, another CMTA board member, has a goal of  
10 zero waste to landfills.

11 Raytheon, another CMTA board member, has a goal  
12 of striving to eliminate waste and emissions, which is  
13 very similar to the language that we have in our report,  
14 our strategic plan.

15 Canon Company has a goal of reaching zero  
16 landfill waste.

17 Epson has a goal of reaching zero waste in all  
18 plants by the year 2010.

19 Dupont also has a goal of zero waste and  
20 emissions.

21 So I want to assure you it's not something that  
22 we take lightly, it's something that we think is  
23 important to the future of dealing with waste issues in  
24 California, and it's something that we recognize that the  
25 business community in a number of ways has accepted as



1 something that's a goal that they're going to try to  
2 strive for. And I think it's a goal that is important  
3 for us to strive for as we move forward with our  
4 strategic plan.

5 In terms of where I think we may agree on some  
6 things. One of the things that was brought up was input.  
7 I'm very sensitive to that issue, and I think that the  
8 suggestions that the business community would like to be  
9 more involved in the implementation of this plan as it  
10 goes forward is a good one and something, we should be  
11 accepting input from any of the stakeholders who want to  
12 have input in the plan.

13 But my suggestion would be that we perhaps have  
14 a quarterly update at an open public Board meeting with,  
15 you know, input from anyone who wants to provide the  
16 input; a quarterly update on the progress of the  
17 implementation of the strategic plan; and then perhaps a  
18 yearly, more formal review of the plan to see if it's  
19 where we want to be or if we want to make any mid-course  
20 adjustments.

21 I agree with Board Member Jones that some of the  
22 definitions ought to be put in the plan. I think that's  
23 a good suggestion to put some definitions in the plan. I  
24 think Rubia provided in her presentation this morning  
25 some suggested definitions, I liked the approach that she

1 was taking.

2 And, and one other area. Environmentally  
3 preferred purchasing area, some of the suggestions from  
4 the focus group were that we look to the U.S.  
5 Environmental Protection Agency's program for  
6 environmental purchasing. I think that's a good  
7 suggestion to include in the report as an example of the  
8 type of program that we draw from, as we do  
9 environmentally preferred purchasing programs in  
10 California. But I'd like to keep our original language  
11 in addition, and then use the Thursday Group's suggestion  
12 as an example of that.

13 BOARD CHAIR MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mike.

14 The problem with being chair is that everybody  
15 has said everything you wanted to say before they get to  
16 you.

17 But I would like to see, one thing the Thursday  
18 Group brought up and I certainly agree with is an annual  
19 review of our strategic plan. And I think it's good for  
20 the staff and good for the Board members, and good for  
21 stakeholders to all know what we're striving for.

22 And I also see the need for definitions, and so  
23 hopefully we can talk about that when we actually take  
24 action next Tuesday.

25 And then the last thing that I wanted to say is

1 I certainly would want to, in the environmental justice  
2 area is I certainly want to be consistent with what Cal  
3 EPA is putting forward.

4 And so --

5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Madam Chair.

6 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Oh, Senator Roberti.

7 And I just wanted to say too that, in  
8 conclusion, that I hope, you know, this is just for  
9 input, and I hope staff can try and capture everything  
10 all the different Board members are saying, because we're  
11 certainly not taking action here today.

12 Senator Roberti.

13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes, Madam Chair. To put  
14 my two cents in, and I'll save most of my remarks for the  
15 actual meeting.

16 But I do think the statement is a definite step  
17 forward, especially in the area of product stewardship  
18 which is something we are almost fearful of mentioning  
19 the words at times, but there it is in our draft  
20 statement, and I think that that's positive and very  
21 important, and it's something that I expect we'll push  
22 through and won't dilute between now and our meeting next  
23 week.

24 And I would like to add that I'm happy for the  
25 mix of testimony that we had, both from business but also

1 from our representatives in the environmental community,  
2 I hope bodes well for them coming here.

3 MS. MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Senator.

4 And thank you, staff. You've done a real job,  
5 Ms. Rubia, and I really appreciate all your work.

6 And with that we'll conclude and see you at  
7 1:30.

8 (Thereupon the foregoing meeting was concluded  
9 at 12:32 p.m.)

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

2

3 I, DORIS M. BAILEY, a Certified Shorthand  
4 Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter, in and for  
5 the State of California, do hereby certify that I am a  
6 disinterested person herein; that I reported the  
7 foregoing meeting in shorthand writing; and thereafter  
8 caused my shorthand writing to be transcribed by  
9 computer.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
11 attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings, nor  
12 in any way interested in the outcome of said proceedings.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
14 as a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered  
15 Professional Reporter on the 20th day of November, 2001.

16

17

18

19 Doris M. Bailey, CSR, RPR, CRR  
20 Certified Shorthand Reporter  
21 License Number 8751

22

23

24

25

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

□